RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
MAY 22 2007

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the above-identified application in view of the following remarks.

Status of Claims

Claim 9 has been previously canceled. Claims 5 and 7 are herein canceled without prejudice to filing a divisional or continuation application. Claims 1-4, 8, 10-19 have been amended. Therefore, Claims 1-4, 6, and 10-19 are currently pending in this application. It is respectfully submitted that no new matter has been added.

Claim Rejections

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejections

In numbered paragraph 4 on pages 4-5 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-3, 6-8, 10-11, 15, and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Gollnick et al. (US Patent No. 5,940,771). Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 1-3, 6-8, 10-11, 15, and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) be withdrawn in view of the foregoing amendments and the remarks that follow.

Amended Claim 1 includes, *inter alia*:

> receiving through an antenna of a radio frequency module a pilot signal at a first clock rate during at least part of a first time period of a wake period of a slotted mode; deactivating said radio frequency module; determining a pseudo-random noise offset of said pilot signal at a second, faster clock rate during at least part of a second time period of said wake period; and synchronizing said radio frequency module to said determined offset if said module is out of step with said determined offset.

Amended Claims 10 and 15 include, *inter alia*:

> an antenna; a radio frequency module coupled to said antenna for receiving a pilot signal at a first clock rate during at least part of a first time period of a wake period of a slotted mode; and a processor for deactivating said radio frequency module after said pilot signal is

> received and for determining a pseudo-random noise offset of said pilot signal at a second, faster clock rate during at least part of a second time period of said wake period and for synchronizing said radio frequency module to said determined offset if said module is out of step with said determined offset.

It is respectfully submitted that Gollnick does not teach these features.

In contrast, Gollnick teaches "The terminal is operated normally at a slow system clock rate, of the order of 2400 baud, to minimize the generation of digital noise, and is switched to a fast clock rate such as 9600 baud during barcode scanning to allow the data obtained from the barcode scan to be processed at a higher rate." (Gollnick, Col. 5, Lines 56-61). Gollnick further teaches "bar code reading requires high system clock rates in the roaming terminals during data gathering to provide decoding of bar code scans at an acceptable rate." (Gollnick, Col. 24, Lines 16-19). Thus, Gollnick teaches both receiving the barcode data and processing the barcode data at a higher clock rate.

On the contrary, Applicants claim "receiving a pilot signal at a first clock rate " and "determining a pseudo-random noise offset of said pilot signal at a second, faster clock rate". Thus, receiving the signal occurs at a slower clock rate and determining an offset from the signal occurs at a higher clock rate. It is respectfully submitted that Gollnick teaches receiving and processing at a higher clock rate while Applicants claim receiving at a slower clock rate and determining at a faster clock rate.

Furthermore, Applicants claim that the aforementioned steps of receiving and determining occur during the claimed "wake period of a slotted mode". In contrast, Gollnick is absent any teaching towards a slotted mode. Gollnick only teaches a "slot" when describing that "A [Collision Sense Multiple Access] CSMA random-backoff algorithm specifies backoff delays as a function of the CSMA slot time." (Col. 42, Lines 19-20). CSMA is well-known in the art as a method for handling concurrent transmissions over a shared medium. In contrast, the claimed slotted mode is a periodic wake period and sleep period during an idle state of a wireless device.

Lastly, Gollnick is absent any teaching or suggestion of the claimed "pseudo-random noise offset" or "synchronizing said radio frequency module to said determined offset if said module is out of step with said determined offset."

It is therefore respectfully submitted that amended independent Claims 1, 10, and 15 are not anticipated by Gollnick. Each of Claims 2-3, 6, 8, 11, and 16 depends from one of independent amended Claims 1, 10, and 15 and is therefore likewise patentable. Claim 7 has been canceled herein thus rendering its rejection moot. The rejection of claims 1-3, 6-8, 10-11, 15, and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Gollnick is therefore requested to be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

In numbered paragraphs 5-8 on pages 5-8 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 4-5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gollnick in view of Challa et al. (US Patent No. 6,453,181). The Examiner also rejected Claims 12 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gollnick in view of Sih et al. (US Patent No. 6,608,858). The Examiner also rejected Claims 13, 14, 18, and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gollnick in view of Watts, Jr., et al. (US Patent No. 6,173,409). Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 4-5, 12-14, and 17-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn in view of the foregoing amendments and the remarks that follow.

Claim 5 has been canceled herein thus rendering its rejection moot. Each of Claims 4, 12-14, and 17-19 depends from one of independent Claims 1, 10, and 15, which as discussed above are allowable over Gollnick. It is respectfully submitted that the addition of the teachings of Challah, Sih, and Watts Jr. do not cure the deficiencies of Gollnick. Therefore, it is submitted that Claims 4-5, 12-14, and 17-19 are likewise patentable.

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of Claims 4-5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gollnick in view of

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
MAY 2 2 2007

Challa, the rejection of Claims 12 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gollnick in view of Sih and the rejection of Claims 13, 14, 18, and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gollnick in view of Watts, Jr.

Applicants acknowledge the Examiner's citation of non-applied references. It is respectfully submitted that the pending claims are patentable over this art.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that the pending claims distinguish over the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and passage to issue are therefore respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned to discuss any still outstanding matters with respect to the present application.

Except for the fee for the RCE, being paid separately, no fees are believed to be due in connection with this paper. However if any such fees are due, please charge any fees associated with this paper to deposit account No. 50-3355.

Respectfully submitted,

Caleb Pollack
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 37,912

Dated: May 22, 2007

Pearl Cohen Zedek Latzer, LLP.
1500 Broadway, 12th Floor
New York, NY 10036
Phone: (646) 878-0800
Fax: (646) 878-0801